

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

LHF PRODUCTIONS, INC.,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

AGUSTIN BERTOLIN, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:16-cv-02028-JAD-NJK

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is a discovery plan, Docket No. 36, which is hereby **DENIED**. The discovery plan identifies the wrong plaintiff. *See* Docket No. 36 at 1 (identifying the plaintiff as “Criminal Productions, Inc.”). The discovery plan fails to state the date the first defendant appeared. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The discovery plan fails to state the number of days sought for discovery. *Id.* The discovery plan fails to provide the signature block for Court approval, in the form required. *See* Local Rule 26-1(b)(10); *see also* Local Rule IA 6-2.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The discovery plan is also untimely. *See* Local Rule 26-1(a); *see also* Docket No. 18 (docket text). The discovery plan itself contends that the failure to comply with the applicable deadline was caused by the failure of Defendant Donald Plain to approve the plan. Docket No. 36 at 2. The Court reminds the parties and counsel that they must comply with the deadlines set by the Court and by the Local Rules. To the extent they are unable to do so, they must seek relief from the Court. Simply ignoring the deadline is not appropriate.

In light of the filing of a discovery plan, Plaintiff no longer must file the declaration ordered at Docket No. 34.

1 A discovery plan that complies with the Local Rules shall be filed by May 11, 2017.

2 IT IS SO ORDERED

3 Dated: April 28, 2017



4  
5 NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge